

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHASOM BROWN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
GOOGLE LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-03664-YGR](#) (SVK)

**ORDER REGARDING DOCUMENTS
SUBMITTED FOR IN-CAMERA
REVIEW**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 456, 468, 486

Plaintiffs sought in-camera review of certain documents for which Defendant claims privilege in whole or in part. Dkt. 456. The Court found cause to review four of the disputed documents in-camera and asked for briefing from Defendant. Dkt. 468, Dkt. 486. The Court has reviewed the submissions of both Parties, conducted an in-camera review of the disputed documents and **ORDERS** as follows:

Document	Ruling
GOOG-CABR-03667431	The document is covered by the attorney-client privilege; no production and may be clawed back.
GOOG-CABR-05766200	The redacted sections under “Considerations . . . privacy” and “Privacy review guidance” are covered by the attorney-client privilege, and the redactions remain in place.
GOOG-BRWN-00846508	At page -00846513: The redacted bullet point which begins “Option 1:” and continues on the same line ending with “types” shall be unredacted. The sub-bullets that follow are to remain redacted. The redacted bullet point which begins “Option 2:” and continues to the next line ending with “headers” shall be unredacted. The sub-bullets that follow are to remain redacted.

	All other redactions remain in place as covered by the attorney-client privilege.
GOOG-CABR-00547295	The redaction sections at -296 are covered by the attorney-client privilege, and the redactions remain in place.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 24, 2022



SUSAN VAN KEULEN
United States Magistrate Judge